he is made to add, by way of qualification, and in *opposition* to what he has already said, that *[6] inasmuch as he has not seen *all* the fine women and fine diamonds in the world, he cannot admit that she excells *all*" If he *had* admitted that she excelled *many*^ this conclusion would be consistent and intelligible; but *not* admitting that position, as he is thus made to do, it is inconsequential, if not absurd.

I agree therefore entirely with Dr. Warburton and Dr. Johnson in thinking that the passage as it stands in the old copy, is nonsense, and that some emendation is necessary,

Dr, Warburton, as I have already observed, amended the passage by omitting the word *not*; but of all the modes of emendation this is the most exceptionable. I have often had occasion to observe that one of the most frequent errours of the press is omission, and consequently the least exceptionable of all emendations is the insertion of a word that appears from the context, or from the metre, to have been omitted. In the first folio edition of Love's Labour's Lost, we find—

" O, that your face were full of oes —„"

Instead of the true reading, which is furnished by the quarto, 1598 :

" O, that your face were *not so* full of oes —."

Again, in Timon of Athens, Act V. edit. 1623 :

«----Nothing can you steal

" But thieves do lose it. *Steal less* ; for this,—"

All the modern editions here rightly read—" Steal *not* less; for this."

Again, in Romeo and Juliet, folio, 1632: "" — they stand so much on the new form, that they *can sit* at ease on the old bench : " instead of " — they can *not* sit," &c. Again, in The Merry Wives of Windsor, folio, 1623, p. 55 : " — good gentlemen, let *him strike* the old woman;" instead of " — let him *not* strike the old woman.[11] Again, in King Lear, 1623, folio: [ei] — the observation we have made of it *hath been little ;* [M] instead of the true reading which is found in the quarto,—[ef] hath *not* been little." I could easily add twenty other instances of the same kind.

In the passage before us, I am persuaded that either the word *but* was omitted after *not,* by the carelessness of the compositor or transcriber, or, that *not* was printed instead of *but:* a mistake that has often happened in these plays. See vol. vi. p. 379.

Of the latter opinion is Mr. Heath, who proposes to read, ** I could *but* believe," and this affords nearly the same meaning as the reading now adopted. I rather incline to the emendation which I proposed some years ago, and which is now placed in the text, because the adversative particle in the next clause of the sentence is thus more fully opposed to what pre-